REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The final Office Action dated October 18, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 9 and 22 are hereby amended, and claims 13 and 26 are canceled. Accordingly, claims 1–12, 14–25, and 27 are currently pending, with claims 1–8 and 15–21 withdrawn from consideration. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 9–14 and 22–27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,646,689 to Matsuda (hereinafter "Matsuda"); and claims 9–14 and 22–27 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,710,843 to Choo et al (hereinafter "Choo").

In the Office Action, claims 9–14 and 22–27 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 8 of Choo. Applicants respectfully submit that Choo has neither common inventorship nor common assignment with the present application. More specifically, Choo is assigned to Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., whereas the present application is assigned to LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd. Further, there is nothing to suggest that the present invention is the result of a joint research agreement between Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection is moot and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

In the Office Action, claims 9–14 and 22–27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Matsuda. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of independent claim 9 and request reconsideration. Independent claim 9 is allowable in that it recites "at least one buffer line disposed between each of the alignment layer line, the liquid crystal layer line, the sealant coating line, the assembling line, and the cutting line to synchronize movement of the first and second substrates." Nothing in Matsuda teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

The Examiner cites the restraining step of Matsuda as teaching the above feature of the present invention. Applicants respectfully disagree. Matsuda teaches a restraining feature as follows: "although great force is applied from the pressurizer during the alignment, it is prevented that the substrates are displaced from the surface plates during the alignment because the first and second substrates are restrained in the direction parallel to the surface by the first and second supporters." (Col. 4, ll. 8–13). Applicants respectfully assert that the "at least one buffer line ..." claimed in claim 9 is patentably distinct from the restraining feature taught by Matsuda. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9, and its dependent claims 10–12 and 14, are allowable over Matsuda.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of independent claim 22 and request reconsideration. Independent claim 22 is allowable in that it recites "synchronizing movement of the first and second substrates by maintaining one of the first and second substrates in a buffer." Nothing in Matsuda teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, for the same or similar reasons as those applying to claim 9 above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 22, and its dependent claims 23–25 and 27, are allowable over Matsuda.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed..

Dated: January 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes

Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant